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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting retrospective study trying to investigate risk factors and outcomes of urosepsis during and after surgery for calculous pyonephrosis. I am concerned about the number of patients that ended up being included in the study, I think a larger study group would increase the statistical power, although I also understand that authors might be limited in this aspect.

My other concern is the controversial development of urosepsis during anesthesia and surgery, although this has been explained further in your manuscript, the readers will probably still have reason to doubt this. This on its own is a whole new subject of study since there are too many factors that can interfere from surgical and anesthetic perspectives. I think it might be too bold to accept this as certainty of development of sepsis during surgery, without more data to back up the affirmation.

Page 6, in the criteria described to diagnose Intraoperative urosepsis it is mentioned that the hemodynamic changes were cold be treated with Dantrolene. Could you explain further on how many patients received this treatment, or in how many was Malignant hyperthermia actually suspected?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
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